



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,467	03/18/2004	Timothy E. Beres	026125-000400US	7245

67590 7590 03/26/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER, 8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/804,467	Applicant(s) BERES ET AL.	
	Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/1/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Application filed on 3/18/2004.
2. Claims 1-42 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. This Information Disclosure Statements filed by Applicant on 9/30/2004 and 8/1/2005 have been received and considered. Copy of the reviewed IDS (8/1/2005) is enclosed with this office action.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to because of missing Application No information and including private information (e.g., Attorney Docket No) in paragraphs [0001], [0024], [0039], [0061], [0065] and [0066]. It is required to take away all Attorney Docket No information and use Application No information to identify the referred patent applications.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 13-21 and 35 are objected to because of the following informalities: grammar error and missing word.

Regarding claim 13, rewrite the phrase “determining the record *is associated* with a good stop document”.

Regarding claim 14, rewrite the phrases “determining the record *is associated* with a good stop document”, “determining the record *is associated* with a deed document” and “determining the records *include* a record associated with a mortgage document linked to the deed”; and add the word “*and*” at the end of line 3.

Regarding claim 15, rewrite the phrases “determining the record *is associated* with a good stop document” and “determining the record *is associated* with a deed document”.

Regarding claim 16, rewrite the phrases “determining the record *is associated* with a good stop document”, “determining the record *is associated* with a warranty deed”, “determining the records *include* a second record” and “determining the records *do not include* a third deed record”.

Regarding claim 17, rewrite the phrases “determining the record *is associated* with a good stop document” and “determining the record *is associated* with a government transfer deed”.

Regarding claim 18, rewrite the phrase “determining the records *do not include* a good stop record”.

Regarding claim 19, rewrite the phrases “determining the record *is associated* with a lien document” and “determining the records *do not include* a release record”.

Regarding claim 20, rewrite the phrase “determining the record *is associated* with a document”.

Regarding claim 21, rewrite the phrase “determining the record *does not include* a location attribute”.

Regarding claim 35, the phrase “, *each record*” is believed to be missed after the phrase “to receive a plurality of records” in line 2; and the word “*and*” is believed to be missed before the phrase “to create a plurality of organization links” in line 3.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 3, 9, 10, 14, 16, 18, 19, 31, 34 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the lien" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the lien" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "the record" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the records" in line 4 and the limitation "the deed" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "the records" in line 5 and line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the records" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the records" in line 3 and the limitation "the lien" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 31 recites the limitation "the lien" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 34 recites the limitation "the first level record" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "The method of claim 41" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferguson et al. (US Patent No 6,237,011).

As to claim 1, Ferguson et al. teaches:

“A computerized method for organizing and displaying documents for a title examination” (see Abstract and [column 2, lines 15-20], the method comprising:

“receiving a plurality of records, each record having a plurality of attributes associated with a document recorded with a government entity” (see [column 6, lines 1-20]);

“creating a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one of the records” (see [column 2, lines 15-25] and [column 8, lines 20-33]);

“displaying the records” (see [column 13, lines 32-35] for detailed list of documents);

“displaying the created links between the records” (see [column 8, lines 28-33]).

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15, 17-27, 29, 30 and 35-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rush et al. (US Patent No 7,131,069).

As to claim 1, Rush et al. teaches:

“A computerized method for organizing and displaying documents for a title examination” (see Abstract), the method comprising:

“receiving a plurality of records, each record having a plurality of attributes associated with a document recorded with a government entity” (see [column 2, lines 15-30] and Fig. 1 wherein information related to a document (e.g., document identification [column 3, lines 45-60]) is equivalent to each record as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 6, lines 57-61]);

“creating a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one of record” (see Abstract and [column 9, lines 5-10]);

“displaying the records” (see Fig. 1); and

“displaying the created links between the records (see Fig. 1 and [column 9, lines 5-10] and [column 12, lines 65-67]).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“creating an assignment link from a first record associated with a first document to a second record associated with a second document assigned to the first document” (see [column 3, lines 35-43] and [column 12, lines 65-67] wherein relationship between document and subdocument as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “assignment link”).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“creating a positive cure link from a first record associated with a lien document to a second record associated a cure document that cures the lien” (see [column 8, lines 25-30] wherein relationship (linked by unique AP invoice identifier) between Accounts Payable Invoice document (lien document) and Accounts Payable Payment document (cure document) is equivalent to Applicant’s “cure link”).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“creating an probable cure link from a first record associated with a lien document to a second record associated with a cure document, the cure document being a probable cure to the lien document (see [column 8, lines 25-30] and [column 17, lines 25-30] wherein relationship (linked by unique AP invoice identifier) between Accounts Payable Invoice document (lien document) and Accounts Payable Payment document (cure document) is equivalent to Applicant’s “probably cure link”).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“creating a link from a first record associated with a first deed document to a second record associated with a second deed document” ([column 9, line 5-10] wherein each type of business document representing a business transaction is equivalent to a deed document).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“creating a link from a first record associated with a first document to a second document, wherein the second document amends the first document” (see [column 7, lines 15-40] wherein the relationship (link) between the Sale Order document and the Sales Order Item Release document as described is equivalent to the link as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language since the Sale Order Item Release document amends release time information of the Sale Order document).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“creating a link from a first record associated with a first document to a second record associated with a second document wherein the second document is a re-recording of the first document” (see [column 3, 35-40] wherein a sub document can be considered as re-recording of a document since sub document is disclosed as a portion of a document and appearing multiple times).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“creating a link from a first document associated with a lien document to a second record associated with a release document partially releasing the lien” (see [column 8, lines 25-30] wherein relationship (linked by unique AP invoice identifier) between Accounts Payable Invoice document (lien document) and Accounts Payable Payment document (release document) is equivalent to Applicant’s “link” since the payment document releases the invoice document).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“before displaying the records, creating a sentinel link from one of the records to an indicator of an organizational property associated with the record” (see [column 3, lines 45-67], [column 4, lines 15-30] and Fig. 7 wherein link between document instance node (document or record) and document type node (organization property) in the hierarchical tree structure is equivalent to Applicant’s “sentinel link”).

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein creating the sentinel link comprises creating a link from the record to a simulated record associated with a simulated document, the simulated document indicating the organizational property” (see [column 3, lines 45-67], [column 4, lines 15-30] and Fig. 7 wherein link between document instance node (document or record) and document type node (organization property) in the hierarchical tree structure is equivalent to Applicant’s “sentinel link”; see Fig. 17 wherein the document type node “Customers” represents a simulated document [column 4, lines 15-30] and record “Customers” represents a simulated record since the document type node does not cause the display of information for a particular document).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the records are received from search logic using an initial one of the records as a starting point for the search and wherein creating the sentinel link comprises creating a link from the initial record to a starting search indicator” (see [column 11, lines 35-67], [column 12, lines 1-25] and Fig. 7-8 wherein entry point is equivalent to Applicant’s “starting point” and node “Customers” or “Sales Orders” are example of starting search indicator).

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“determining the record is associated with a good stop document, the record being a good stop for a title search” (see [column 11, lines 40-55] and [column 12, lines 1-10] for designating some documents as entry points);

“creating a link from the record to a good stop indicator” (see Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 wherein each document type node represents a good stop indicator).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“determining the record is associated with a deed document having a subdivision developer grantor” (see [column 15, lines 15-25] wherein any business transaction document (etc., sales order document) is equivalent to Applicant’s “deed document”).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein determining the record is associated with a good stop document comprises determining the record is associated with a government transfer deed” (see [column 16, lines 50-55] for shipper document).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“determining the records do not include a good stop record associated with a document being a good stop for a title search” (see [column 21, lines 20-30]);

“selecting a deed record from the records” (see [column 15, lines 15-25] wherein any business transaction document (etc., sales order document) is equivalent to Applicant’s “deed document”); and

“creating a link from the deed record to a no good stop indicator” (see Abstract and [column 24, lines 25-65] for creation of expression).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“determining the record is associated with a lien document” (see [column 24, lines 35-40] wherein invoice is equivalent to a lien document);

“determining the record do not include a release record associated with a document that cures the lien” (see [column 24, lines 35-40] for invoice outstanding meaning no record of payment); and

“creating a link from the record to a non-cured indicator” (see [column 24, lines 35-40] and [column 23, lines 32-38] wherein POI icon is equivalent to Applicant’s “non-cured indicator”).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“determining the record is associated with a document which may cloud ownership of a property” (see [column 24, lines 24-44]); and

“creating a link from the record to a title cloud indicator” (see [column 25, 24-44] for creating POI expression).

As to claim 21, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“determining the record does not include a location attribute” (see [column 3, lines 45-65]); and

“creating a link from the record to a name indicator indicating the record is associated with a name and not a location” (see [column 3, lines 45-67]).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein displaying the records comprises displaying the records in an ordered list ordered by a record data attribute of the records, the displayed attributes of the records further

including one or more of a reception number, a document type, a document category, a grantee name, and a grantor name” (see Fig. 1 and [column 23, lines 55-60]).

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein displaying the records comprises displaying each of the records as a node in a graph, the displayed attributes of each of the records attributes including one or more of a recordation date, a reception number, and a document type” (see Fig. 1).

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 23 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein displaying the created links comprises displaying the created links as edges in the graph” (see Fig. 1 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein displaying the records comprises displaying the records in a first level of a hierarchical display format” (see Fig. 7).

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 25 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein displaying the created links comprises for each of the records displayed in the first level, displaying the records linked to the first level record at a nested level lower than the first level” (see Fig. 1 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

As to claim 27, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 25 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the hierarchical display format comprises a hierarchical tree format” (see Fig. 1 and [column 9, lines 5-10]).

As to claim 29, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 28 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the organizational categories include one or more of non-cured documents, possibly cured documents, documents which may cloud title to a property, cured lien document, cured documents releasing a non-returned lien document, and good-stop document for a title search” (see [column 10, lines 1-10] and [column 23, lines 5-55]).

As to claim 30, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 28 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the records are received from search logic using an initial one of the records as a starting point for the search, the method further comprising color-coding the initial record to indicate the record is the starting record” (see [column 11, lines 37-55], [column 21, lines 20-35] and [column 23, lines 60-65]).

As to claim 35, Rush et al. teaches:

“A system” (see Abstract) comprising:

“logic, to receive a plurality of records having a plurality of attributes associated with a document recorded with a government entity, to create a plurality of organization links, each link defining a relationship from a document associated with one of the records to a second document associated with a second one of record” (see [column 2, lines 15-30], [column 9, lines 5-10] and Fig. 1 wherein information related to a document (e.g., document identification [column 3, lines 45-60]) is equivalent to each record as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 6, lines 57-61]); and

“a display mechanism communicatively coupled to the logic, the display mechanism to displaying the records and created links” (see Fig. 1 and [column 9, lines 5-10] and [column 12, lines 65-67]).

As to claim 36, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the logic creates organizational links between records associated with documents having one or more of an assignment relationship, a curing relationship indicating the first document cures the second document, a corrective relationship indicating the first document corrects the second document, an amendment relationship indicating the first document amends the second document, and a mortgage relationship indicating the first document places a mortgage on a deed associated with the second document” (see [column 3, lines 35-43] and [column 12, lines 65-67] wherein relationship between document and subdocument as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “assignment link”).

As to claim 37, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“creating a sentinel link from one of the records to an indicator of an organizational property associated with the record” (see [column 3, lines 45-67], [column 4, lines 15-30] and Fig. 7 wherein link between document instance node (document or record) and document type node (organization property) in the hierarchical tree structure is equivalent to Applicant’s “sentinel link”).

As to claim 38, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 37 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the logic creates the sentinel link for one of a record used as a starting point for a title search, a record associated with a good stop document for the title search, a record associated with a non-cured lien document, and a record associated with a document which may cloud ownership of a property” (see [column 11, lines 35-67], [column 12, lines 1-25] and Fig. 7-8 wherein entry point is equivalent to Applicant’s “starting point” and link to node “Customers” or “Sales Orders” are example of sentinel link for a starting point).

As to claim 39, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the display mechanism displays the records as node in a graph and displays the links as edges in the graph” (see Fig. 1 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

As to claim 40, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the display mechanism displays the records in a first level of a hierarchical display format and displays the records linked to the first level records in a nested level lower than the first level” (see Fig. 1 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

As to claim 41, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 35 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the display mechanism displays the records in color-coded format, the color indicating an organizational category of the document associated with the record” (see [column 23, lines 5-15] wherein using various icon to visually symbolize different types of documents is equivalent to color-coded format as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 42, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. teaches:

“wherein the organizational categories include one or more of non-cured documents, possibly cured documents, documents which may cloud title to a property, cured lien document, cured documents releasing a non-returned lien document, and good stop document for a title search” (see [column 10, lines 1-10], [column 23, lines 5-55] and Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2164

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rush et al. (US Patent No 7,131,069) as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Whinery et al. (Publication No US 2005/0187863).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. does not teach:

“creating a link from a first record associated with a deed document to a second record associated with a mortgage document”.

Whinery et al. teaches the association of deed document and mortgage document regarding a real estate (see [0020]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rush et al. by the teaching of Whinery et al. to add the feature of creating a link from a deed document to mortgage document since this feature provides an effective way to present relationships between different documents related to a real estate.

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. does not teach:

“determining the record is associated with a deed document”; and

“determining the records include a record associated with a mortgage document linked to the deed”.

Whinery et al. teaches the association of deed document and mortgage document relating to a real estate (see [0020]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rush et al. by the teaching of Whinery et al. to add the features of determining a deed document and determining mortgage document link to the deed document since these features provide an effective way to determine relationships between different documents related to a real estate.

14. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rush et al. (US Patent No 7,131,069) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Whatley et al. (Publication No US 2002/0052755).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. does not teach:

“determining the record is associated with a warranty deed document having a first date”;

“determining the records include a second record associated with a second deed document having a second data later than the first date”; and

“determining the records do not including a third deed record having a date between the first date and the second date”.

Whinery et al. teaches certifying a title chain.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rush et al. by the teaching of Whinery et al. to add the features of determining different records associated with different warranty deed documents relating to a real estate since these features provide an effective way to determine relationships between different documents related to a real estate.

15. Claims 28 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rush et al. (US Patent No 7,131,069) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Woodings et al. (Publication No US 2004/0267595).

As to claim 28, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. does not teach:

“wherein displaying the records comprises displaying the records in color-coded format, the color indicating an organizational category of the document associated with the record”.

Woodings et al. teaches color coding various user interface representations (see [0142] and [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rush et al. by the teaching of Woodings et al. on color coding to add the features of displaying the records in color-coded format, the color indicating an organizational category of the document associated with the record since color coding is well

known in the art and using color coding provides an effective way to view and recognize information in presentations on a graphical user interface.

As to claim 31, Rush et al. teaches:

““A computerized method for organizing and displaying documents for a title examination” (see Abstract), the method comprising:

“receiving a plurality of records, each record having a plurality of attributes associated with a document recorded with a government entity” (see [column 2, lines 15-30] and Fig. 1 wherein information related to a document (e.g., document identification [column 3, lines 45-60]) is equivalent to each record as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 6, lines 57-61]);

“creating curing links, each curing link defining a curing relationship between one of the records associated with a lien document to a second one of the records associated a cure document that releases the lien” (see [column 8, lines 25-30] wherein relationship (linked by unique AP invoice identifier) between Accounts Payable Invoice document (lien document) and Accounts Payable Payment document (cure document) is equivalent to Applicant’s “curing link” since the payment document releases or cures the invoice document);

“creating one or more sentinel links, each sentinel link associating one of the records to an indicator of an organizational property associated with the record” (see [column 3, lines 45-67], [column 4, lines 15-30] and Fig. 7 wherein link between document instance node (document

or record) and document type node (organization property) in the hierarchical tree structure is equivalent to Applicant's "sentinel link");

"the displayed attributes of the records including a recordation date, a reception number, and a document category" (see Fig. 1 and [column 3, lines 45-60]; and

"displaying the created links between the records (see Fig. 1 and [column 9, lines 5-10] and [column 12, lines 65-67]).

Rush et al. does not teach:

"color coding the records with a color indicating a category of the record"; and

"displaying the records using the color code".

Woodings et al. teaches color coding various user interface representations (see [0142] and [0170]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rush et al. by the teaching of Woodings et al. on color coding to add the features of color coding the records with a color indicating a category of the record and displaying the records using the color code since color coding is well known in the art and using color coding provides an effective way to view and recognize information in presentations on a graphical user interface.

As to claim 32, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. as modified teaches:

“ wherein creating a sentinel link comprises creating a link from a record to an indicator indicating one of a starting search indicator, a good stop indicator, and a non-cured indicator” (see [column 11, lines 35-67], [column 12, lines 1-25] and Fig. 7-8 wherein entry point is equivalent to Applicant’s “starting point” and link to node “Customers” or “Sales Orders” are example of sentinel link to starting search indicator).

As to claim 33, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. as modified teaches:

“wherein displaying the records comprises displaying each of the records as a node in a graph and wherein displaying the created links comprises displaying the links as edges in the graph” (see Fig. 1, [column 3, lines 45-60] and [column 20, lines 25-35]).

As to claim 34, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Rush et al. as modified teaches:

“wherein displaying the records comprises displaying each record in a first hierarchical level and wherein displaying the created links comprises for each of the records displayed in the first level, displaying the records linked to the first level record at a nested level lower than the first level” (see Fig. 7 and [column 20, lines 25-65]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

March 15, 2007



**CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**